These conclusions are rather strikingly affirmed by the situation in the Netherlands. There the absence of an effective central authority and the decay of the smaller jurisdictions permitted the emergence of independent local units, each following its own legal devices. The consequence was largely to prevent the growth of any general coöperation between the courts of the different cities and districts and to encourage an almost universal preference for the *lex fori*. Characteristically, in cases involving immoveables, this led to the adoption of the *lex loci rei sitae* where it coincided with the *lex fori*, but in the law of inheritance, which in France was decided by the *consuetudo terrae*, the law of the place in which the deceased was a resident or citizen obtained, irrespective of the location of his holdings.

In short, the legal unity fostered in France by the feudal régime, made for the recognition of a non-personal territorial law of the land, whilst in the Netherlands the comparative impotence of such feudal organization as existed, permitted a rampant separatism in which the *lex fori* flourished. Hence, one surmises, the later divergence between Dumoulin and Huber.

The latter pages of the monograph summarize the views touching upon the conflict of customs, which are given by the contemporary French civilians, Jacobus de Ravanis, Petrus de Bella Pertica, Gulielmus de Cuneo, Petrus Jacobi, and Johannes Faber. All follow more or less faithfully the practice of the courts, although Petrus de Bella Pertica and Gulielmus de Cuneo attempt to limit the principle of reality by introducing the famous distinction between *statuta realia* and *statuta personalia*. The inference is suggestive; the striking parallelism of the teachings of the commentators upon the Corpus with the prevailing practice leads to the not unjustifiable suspicion that perhaps the jurisprudence rendered in the courts warped the views of the civilians quite as much as their exposition of legal principles influenced the course of justice. The possibility is not without its significance to the history of private international law, for at least three of the masters of Bartolus, to whom he was largely indebted, drew in turn upon their French contemporaries.

A valuable appendix makes available the texts in which these five writers treat of the conflict of laws, as well as the more significant decisions of the Exchequer of Normandy, the Parlement of Paris, and the Council of Flanders.

HESSEL EDWARD YNTEMA.

AMERICAN LAW OF CHARTER PARTIES AND OCEAN BILLS OF LADING, by Wharton Poor of the New York Bar. Albany, Matthew Bender & Company, 1920, pp. x, 273.

In these days of prolix legal compilations, buried in avalances of undigested citations, this is indeed a rare book. In five short chapters and 146 small pages the author confines his discussion. He adds appendices on the Harter Act, Federal Bill of Lading Act, Time Charter, Rate Charter, for grain, coal, and sailing vessel, and Bill of Lading. The plan of the work is as simple as the fulfillment is brief. He follows "clause by clause the well

known documents in everyday use by shipping men,—time charters, rate charters, ocean bills of lading, including that most important statute, the Harter Act." He cites a few English cases, but for the most part is able to confine citations to cases from the Federal Reporter or Federal Cases, with an occasional decision from the United States Supreme Court.

The author is fortunate in having a very narrow field to cover, in a subject in which all cases are tried before the Federal courts. He has made a very convenient handbook, containing a condensed statement of the leading problems involved in ocean shipping. The admirality lawyer will, doubtless, be glad to have such a book on American law.

E. C. GODDARD.